

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/556,068	ALLAVARPU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Haresh Patel	2154	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Haresh Patel. (3)_____.

(2) Robert C Kowert. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 21 January 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-63.

Identification of prior art discussed: 6,3,63,421.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner and Mr. Robert C Kowert discussed amending the claims. Mr. Robert C. Kowert acknowledged that the proposed claims, dated May 25, 2004, do not carry any significance considering the prior art rejections. Examiner proposed further amending the claims, as seen in the attached faxes. Mr. Robert C Kowert did not agree with the amended claim language. In order to compact the prosecution of this case, examiner further asked Mr. Robert C Kowert to amend the claims for any further necessary clarification and/or for additional limitations. Mr. Robert C. Kowert informed the examiner that no amendment to the claims was necessary before the Final action.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. Box 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Fax Cover Sheet

Date: 20 Jan 2005

To: Robert C Kowert	From: Haresh Patel
Application/Control Number: 09/556,068	Art Unit: 2154
Fax No.: 512-853-8801	Phone No.: 571-272-3973
Voice No.: 512-476-1400	Return Fax No.: (703) 273-3973
Re:	CC:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Urgent <input type="checkbox"/> For Review <input type="checkbox"/> For Comment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For Reply <input type="checkbox"/> Per Your Request	

Comments:

ATTACHED IS A PROPOSED AMEDEMMENT TO SPEED UP THE PROSECUTION OF THE ABOVE APPLICATION AND TO PLACE IT IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

YOUR PROMPT REPLY IS GREATLY APPRECIATED.

NOTE: Considering the IDS submitted cited prior arts, dated 10/14/2004, the previous proposed amendment dated May 25, 2004 needed further amendment as attached. Hence, the previous proposal do not carry significance any more.

Please respond any concerns or a permission for amending the claims, by fax within 24 hours to avoid final rejection, for the newly added claims.

Number of pages 2 including this page

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY

This facsimile transmission is an Official U.S. Government document which may contain information which is privileged and confidential. It is intended only for use of the recipient named above. If you are not the intended recipient, any dissemination, distribution or copying of this document is strictly prohibited. If this document is received in error, you are requested to immediately notify the sender at the above indicated telephone number and return the entire document in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria VA 22313-1450

Art Unit: 2154

Amendment of Claim 1: as follows:

Claim 1: A network management system, comprising:

a gateway coupled between a plurality of managed objects and a plurality of proxy agent managers; and the gateway is configured to deliver events generated by the managed objects to the managers and to deliver requests generated by the managers to the managed objects; wherein, each of the events and each of the requests contain a user identification; wherein, the user identification identifies the respective manager for which the event or the request belongs to;

a platform-independent interface to the gateway, wherein the gateway is configurable to provide communication between the managers and the managed objects through the platform-independent interface to deliver the events and the requests; wherein, the managers share a singleton Request Service Access Point (RequestSAP) object;

wherein the gateway is configurable to provide object-level access control between the managers and the managed objects to receive the events from and to send the requests to the managed objects, wherein said object-level access control is provided by the Request SAP object at an individual object level to grant one of the managers to access one of the managed objects while the Request SAP object preventing the one of the managers being accessed by the other managed objects.

Claims 20: and 39: Addition of similar limitations as claim 1.

Claims 20: and 39: Amendment of these claims with the similar limitations of the above amended claim 1.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. Box 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Fax Cover Sheet

Date: 21 Jan 2005

To: Robert C Kowert	From: Haresh Patel
Application/Control Number: 09/556,068	Art Unit: 2154
Fax No.: 512-853-8801	Phone No.: 571-272-3973
Voice No.: 512-476-1400	Return Fax No.: (703) 273-3973
Re:	CC:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Urgent <input type="checkbox"/> For Review <input type="checkbox"/> For Comment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For Reply <input type="checkbox"/> Per Your Request	

January 20, 2005

Comments:

As per your (Mr. Robert C Kowert) message of Tuesday 18 Jan 2005, you confirmed that you received a fax with the proposed amendment (dated 13 Jan 2005), acknowledged that the presented claims 58-63 for the previously proposed amendment dated May 25, 2004 would not be allowable and the claims 58-63 would be rejected under final rejection, you needed more time until today, and would reply by end of today (20 January 2005,) indicating the selection, i.e., either you would accept the proposed amendment or amend the claims or would like to further continue the prosecution with a final rejection.

In order to compact the prosecution, examiner (Haresh Patel) believes that the proposed amendment would help the client to overcome the prior arts of record. Hence, the examiner would further wait until tomorrow, January 21, 2005, to let the attorney (Mr. Robert C Kowert) still amend the claims before the final rejection is sent out. If attorney/client needs more time examiner would do so and hold the final rejection.

Examiner clarifies that this proposed amendment (faxed, dated 13 Jan 2005) would not carry any significance in future prosecution considering the possibility of the attorney submitting more IDS for the related prior arts and further consideration/search by the examiner of new/old prior arts during future prosecution.

Again, for the remark by Mr. Robert C Kowert, dated, 10/14/2004, "In a facsimile communication dated May 25, 2004, the Examiner suggests two possible limitations, either of which, if incorporated into Applicants' independent claims, would overcome the prior art and render them in a condition for allowance. Correspondingly, new claims 58-60 represent claims 1, 20, and 39, respectively, and include the first of the Examiner's suggested additions, namely, wherein managers use a request SAP for requests and responses." Additionally, new claims 61-63 represent claims 1, 20, and 39, respectively, and include the second of the Examiner's suggested additions, namely, wherein the gateway uses a singleton SAP object that shares a ProxyAgents through which a manager deals with a managed object and allows the insertion of the user name in the request message to enforce object-level access control." Applicants assert that new claims 58-63 are in condition for allowance as expressed by the Examiner in the May 25, 2004 facsimile.", examiner has faithfully provided enough necessary time to the attorney (Mr. Robert C Kowert) to amend the claims before the final rejection is sent out.

Mr. Robert C. Kowert is requested to confirm by tomorrow that he received this fax. Examiner would also call Mr. Robert C. Kowert tomorrow to check the status on it. Until the examiner receives the confirmation that Mr. Robert C. Kowert has received the fax and acknowledged this examiner's clarification, examiner would hold this case.

Number of pages 3 including this page

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY

This facsimile transmission is an Official U.S. Government document which may contain information which is privileged and confidential. It is intended only for use of the recipient named above. If you are not the intended recipient, any dissemination, distribution or copying of this document is strictly prohibited. If this document is received in error, you are requested to immediately notify the sender at the above indicated telephone number and return the entire document in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria VA 22313-1450